

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment After Final is being submitted in response to the Office Action issued April 20, 2006. The Office Action was made final and imposed a deadline of July 20, 2006 for the submission of a response. The Applicant hereby requests a one-month extension of time for responding to the Final Office Action. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct the fee of **\$120.00** under 37 C.F.R. 1.17(a)(1) for the extension of time to respond to the Office Action to August 20, 2006. The Commissioner is also authorized in this and future replies to deduct any fees that may be necessary, including extension of time fees, from Deposit Account No. 13-2400.

This response is being filed concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination under 37 C.F.R. 1.114. A form PTO/SB/30 is being filed concurrently herewith.

The Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8, 15, and 21 of the application to specify that the image file defines a single image of a custom character set including a plurality of characters and that the portion of the image containing the selected character excludes at least one other of the plurality of characters. Support for this amendment may be found throughout the application and, in particular, in paragraphs [0032], [0033], and [0037] – [0043]. In the Applicant's respectful submission, no new matter is introduced by way of this amendment.

Following entry of the amendments to the claims, claims 1-25 remain pending. In the Applicant's respectful submission, no excess claim fees fall due as a result of this amendment.

Examiner Interview

The Applicant appreciates the courtesy of Examiner Washburn and Supervisory Examiner Chauhan in agreeing to conduct a telephone interview with the Applicant's agent, Fraser Rowand, on August 15, 2006. In the course of the interview, the Applicant's agent and the Examiners discussed the claim scope, the Hill reference, and the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections based upon the Hill reference. It was agreed during the interview that the Hill reference

does not appear to teach a system or a method in which a single image contains more than one character of a custom character set and a selected character is rendered by defining a portion of the image that includes the selected character and excludes other characters of the custom character set. The Applicant's agent agreed to prepare and submit an amendment to the claims amplifying this distinction with the Hill reference.

Prior Art Rejections

The present invention discloses a method of rendering text on an output device. In particular, the present invention describes a method in which a character set for a custom font is stored in an image and individual characters are selected, *e.g.* clipped, from the image for rendering on a display to output a text string. By storing more than one character in a single image, the present invention avoids the overhead associated with storing a separate image file for each character in the character set. The present invention also avoids the complex code and processing associated with rendering a vector-based font. As defined in the independent claims of the present application, the method described in the present application includes an image file defining a single image of a custom character set including a plurality of characters and steps of locating a selected character from the custom character set within the image, defining a portion of the image that contains the selected character and excludes at least one other of the plurality of characters, and rendering that portion on the output device.

The Hill et al. reference describes a tool for creating a custom font set. This is the type of tool referred to in paragraph [0004] of the present specification. The Hill et al. reference describes a tool for building, defining, and manipulating individual characters of a custom font. As noted at column 3, lines 19-33, a glyph is a description of the visual appearance of a character within a font. The glyph is composed of one or more graphical objects which together form a tree structure as shown in Figure 1. At column 3, lines 38-46, Hill et al. explain that each graphical object typically includes various information components used in the reproduction of the glyph or font, including primitives. Primitives may be formed in a number of ways and are used to characterize an object shape. As an example, Hill et al.

suggest cubic spline paths may be used to define the shape of an object. As a further example, Hill et al. suggest that image data in the form of a pixel map may define the shape. Accordingly, Hill et al. have suggested that a glyph may be composed of a number of graphical objects, some of which may include pixel maps defining portions of the glyph. In other words, Hill et al. have suggested building a glyph based upon multiple images.

This understanding of Hill et al. is further emphasized at column 5, lines 19-21, which state that the structure of a font from the user's point-of-view is as a collection of graphic objects, of which there at least one per glyph.

The Hill et al. reference goes on to describe various mechanisms for manipulating characters through changing various attributes so as to build a custom font set. The Hill et al. reference nowhere suggests the storage of a single image containing a custom character set. Hill et al. presume no more than one character would be contained in a single image. In fact, Hill et al. suggest the stitching together of various images to create a single character.

Since Hill et al. fail to teach or suggest defining a custom character set in a single image, Hill et al. also fail to suggest steps of locating a selected character from the custom character set within the image, defining a portion of the image containing the selected character and excluding other characters, and rendering that portion on an output device.

Accordingly, the Hill et al. reference fails to teach or suggest many limitations found in the independent claims of the present application. Therefore, the applicant respectfully submits that the Hill et al. reference cannot be considered anticipatory and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

With respect to the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the Manning reference is relied upon by the Examiner to supply the context of rendering characters on the display of a handheld mobile personal device. The Manning reference in no way cures the deficiencies in the teachings of Hill et al. outlined above. Accordingly, the applicant

respectfully submits that the Manning reference fails to bolster the Examiner's obviousness rejections based upon Hill et al. and, therefore, the applicant respectfully requests that these rejections also be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and submissions, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw his rejections and reconsider the present application. The applicant respectfully solicits a timely Notice of Allowance.

Should the Examiner be inclined to maintain the prior art rejections in spite of the foregoing arguments, the applicant respectfully requests a telephone interview to discuss the basis for the Examiner's rejections and to clarify the arguments presented. Should the Examiner wish to discuss the foregoing amendments or arguments, he is invited to telephone the applicant's agent, Fraser Rowand at (416) 868-1482.

Respectfully Submitted,

KLASSEN, Gerhard

By: 

Fraser D. Rowand, Regn. No. 53,870

Place: Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Date: August 18, 2006